BRA
560 ✓

BACK BAY-BEACON HILL
BRA Research Department
Back Bay-Beacon Hill Data Analysis
& Correlations Draft

Property Of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

BOSTON
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

Back Bay
B65R.BaB

DRAFT

Back Bay

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

BACK BAY - BEACON HILL

DATA ANALYSIS

I. Introduction

As the name implies, the BB-BH planning district is really two areas, separated almost completed by the Boston Common and Public Garden. Both areas housing stock is old but substantial and generally well-maintained over the years. Only the Prudential Tower and surrounding new construction between Boylston and Huntington interrupt this pattern.

BB-BH contains 677 acres, bounded by the Charles River to the north and west, Cambridge St and the West End also to the north, the Common and financial district to the east, the South End and Huntington Ave. to the southeast, Fenway to the south, and Boston U. to the west. Back Bay, excepting Prudential, is the City's most perfect , laid out an level full ground. Beacon Hill streets make some attempt to conform to a grid pattern but are thwarted by the slopes of the Hill and the curring boundary streets.

The population of BB-BH has increased steadily over the last 2 decades, although by a small margin. It thus represented a larger prop of the City's population in 1970 than in 1950. From 60-70, looking at BB and BH separately, BB increased in population while BH declined slightly.

Table 1. Total Population - City BB-Bh - 50,60,70

	1950	50-60 %Change	1960	60-70 %Change	1970	50-70 %Change
City	801,444	-12.9	698,081	-8.2	641,071	-20.0
BB-BH	28,150	.7	28,333	2.8	29,117	3.4
% of City Total	3.5		4.1		4.5	
BB			16,871	6.2	17,909	
% of City Total			2.4		2.8	
BH			11,462	2.2	11,208	
% of City Total			1.6		1.8	

The housing stock increased steadily in BB-BH from 1950 and in both BB and BH separately. The districts prop of the City's housing stock increases as well.

Table 2 Total HU's - City, BB-BH - 50,60,70

	1950	50-60 % Change	1960	60-70 % Change	1970	50-70 % Change
City	222,079	+7.5	238,816	-2.7	232,448	+4.7
BB-BH	9,188	61.6*	14,847	13.9	16,916	84.1
% of City Total	4.1		6.2		7.3	
BB			8,267	15.4	9,537	
% of City Total			3.5		4.1	
BH			6,580	12.1	7,379	
% of City Total			2.8		3.2	

*This very large figure is not due primarily to new construction, of which there was little in that decade, but rather shows the effect of subdivisions of all brownstones.

Table 3 Persons and HU's Per Acre - City BB-BH - 50,60, 70

	1950	1960	1970
City Pers/Acre	24.55	21.38	19.64
BB-BH Pers/Acre	41.58	41.85	43.01
City HU's/Acre	6.80	7.31	7.12
BB-BH HU's/Acre	13.57	21.93	24.99

By either measure density was significantly higher in BB-BH than in the City as a whole. In BB-BH, density increased steadily, whereas in the City it declined between 1960 and 1970.

Table 4 - Age Goups - City, BB, BH - 60, 70

			0-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-59	60+
	City	#	152,661	61,060	77,103	79,353	158,258	112,467
1		%	23.9	9.5	12.0	12.4	24.7	17.5
9	BB	#	442	3,185	5,597	3,051	2,993	2,641
7		%	2.5	17.8	31.3	17.0	16.7	14.7
0	BH	#	700	501	2,605	2,748	2,566	2,086
		%	6.2	4.5	23.2	24.2	22.9	18.6

			0-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-59	60+
	City	#	171,812	51,989	54,547	81,004	208,230	122,499
1		%	24.7	7.4	7.8	12.7	29.8	17.6
9	BB	#	551	1,972	3,436	2,870	4,358	3,684
6		%	3.2	11.7	20.4	17.0	25.8	21.9
0	BH	#	775	456	1,617	2,137	3,731	2,748
		%	6.7	4.0	14.1	18.6	32.5	24.0

Looking at 1960 figures reveals that although large props of 15-34 may be at the expense of AG 0-14 at a given time like 1970, the increase in that group has been at the expense of AG;s 35+ since 1960. Note particularly the large proportional decline in AG 35-59.

BG Analysis

Table 5 - Age Groups - Selected BG's - 1970

		0-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-59	60+
106-1	#	28	29	101	166	492	456
	%	2.3	2.3	7.9	13.1	38.7	35.8
106-2	#	62	43	121	114	182	141
	%	9.3	6.5	18.3	17.2	27.5	21.3
107-5	#	39	395	492	199	146	161
	%	2.8	27.6	34.4	13.9	10.2	11.3
107-6	#	19	45	442	264	165	128
	%	1.9	4.2	41.6	24.8	15.6	12.1
201-1	#	112	81	483	411	293	199
	%	7.1	5.1	30.6	26.0	18.6	12.6
201-2	#	140	24	239	510	416	354
	%	8.3	1.4	14.2	30.3	24.7	20.9
202-1	#	65	52	276	229	311	329
	%	5.3	4.1	21.9	18.2	24.6	26.1
202-2	#	63	84	526	244	174	132
	%	5.1	6.9	43.0	20.0	14.3	10.7

Most trends on the tract level reflected district trends. No tract had a large prop of kids in 1960. All tracts lost heavily from AG's 35+. Tracts 201 and 202 were probably most stable (lost the least from AG 35+), and BH and BB were not concerning tracts 203 and 303. There was a huge shift of pop from AG 35+ to AG 20-34. For instance, in tract 303, the prop of AG 25-34 tripled while the props of AG 45-54 and AG 65-74 were halved.

These tracts were the only ones to have a significantly larger % of men than women in 1960, but in 1970 they replaced older single men, probably poorer.

Table 6 Household Size - City, BB-BH - 1960, 1970

			1P	2P	3P	4P	5P+
1970	City	#	62,962	62,202	32,854	23,736	35,717
		%	29.0	28.6	15.1	10.9	16.4
	BB-BH	#	9,279	4,509	1,121	482	226
		%	59.4	28.9	7.2	3.1	1.5
1960	City	#	55,302	60,528	37,794	30,013	40,795
		%	24.6	27.0	16.8	13.4	18.2
		#	7,735	3,959	1,207	590	275
		%	56.2	28.8	8.8	4.3	2.0

Table 7 Household Size - Selected BG's - 1970

		1P	2P	3P	4P	5P+
107-4	#	787	450	93	35	14
	%	57.1	32.6	6.7	2.5	1.1
201-2	#	544	301	71	37	22
	%	55.8	30.9	7.3	3.8	2.2
202-1	#	596	184	48	20	11
	%	69.4	21.4	5.6	2.3	1.3
202-2	#	318	270	71	17	11
	%	46.3	39.3	10.3	2.5	1.6

Table 8 Overcrowding - City, BB, BH - 60, 70

	1960							
	1.01 -pers/rm		1.01-1.50 pers/rm		1.50+pers/rm		1.01+pers/rm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
City	17,929	8.0	12,535	5.8	3,927	1.8	16,462	7.6
B.B.	381	5.0	117	1.4	250	3.0	367	4.4
B.H.	216	3.6	60	.9	117	1.7	177	2.6

Table 9 Overcrowding - Selected Tracts, BG's - 1970

	1.01-1.50 pers/rm		1.50+ pers/rm		1.01+ pers/rm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
101	6	2.0	9	3.0	15	5.0
106-2	7	2.0	12	3.4	19	5.3
107-5	11	1.9	23	4.1	34	6.0
108-3	8	1.7	31	6.5	39	8.2

Table 10 Household Relation - City, BB, BH, 70

		Husbands	F Heads	Other Rel	M Pr.I.	F Pr.I.	Non-Rel	Group	Other
City	#	102,120	31,905	257,256	29,875	46,735	24,659	28,775	119,597
	%	15.9	5.0	40.1	4.7	7.3	3.9	4.5	18.7
B.B.	#	1,564	240	989	2,889	3,799	2,338	4,417	1,680
	%	8.7	1.3	5.5	16.1	21.2	13.0	24.6	9.3
B.H.	#	1,361	275	1,254	2,468	2,437	1,455	438	1,531
	%	12.1	2.5	11.2	22.0	21.7	13.0	3.9	13.6

Note one interesting statistic. For the City as a whole, a much higher percentage of primary individuals are women (61%) than of the whole pop, (54%). IN BB, the percentages are 57% and 61%, and in BH 50% and 53%, respectively. The probable explanation is that primary individuals for the whole City are much more likely to be elderly, where average age at death would produce the above result,; but in BB-BH, primary individuals are much more likely to be young, with the women more inclined than men to stay in dorms or live with other people.

BG Analysis

Table 11 Household Relationship - Selected BG's - 1970

		Husband	F Head	Other Rel	M Pr.I.	F Pr.I.	Non Rel	Group Quarters	Other
106-1	#	288	29	130	190	282	54	0	299
	%	22.6	2.3	10.2	14.9	22.2	4.3	0.0	23.5
106-2	#	60	18	109	165	107	68	68	68
	%	9.1	2.7	16.4	24.9	16.1	10.3	10.3	10.3
107-6	#	76	15	43	238	276	265	72	78
	%	7.2	1.4	4.1	22.4	26.0	24.9	6.8	7.4
108-1	#	166	16	82	36.8	419	197	919	210
	%	7.0	.7	3.5	15.5	17.6	8.3	38.7	8.8
201-3	#	127	26	122	151	178	109	111	129
	%	13.3	2.7	12.8	15.8	18.7	11.4	11.7	13.5
202-1	#	106	36	138	511	196	145	14	116
	%	8.4	2.9	10.9	40.5	15.5	11.5	1.1	9.2

Table 12 Incomes of Renters - City, BB, BH, 106, 303 - 1970

	$5,000		$5-$9,999		$10,000+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
City	64,705	41.0	55,482	35.1	37,785	23.9
BB	3,116	38.0	2,676	32.6	2,419	29.5
BH	2,124	35.4	2,108	35.2	1,763	29.4
106	314	27.5	263	23.0	567	49.6
303	65	23.6	97	35.1	114	41.3

Table 13 - Rent/Income Ratio - City, BB, BH, 106, 303 - 1970

	$5,000				$5,000-$9,999				$10,000+	
	.25-.35		.35+		.25-.35		.35+		.25+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
City	9,736	15.1	44,218	68.3	13,780	24.8	5,164	9.3	1,173	3.1
BB	236	7.6	2,414	77.5	859	32.1	770	28.8	306	12.7
BH	188	8.9	1,648	77.6	720	34.2	555	26.3	186	10.6
106	7	2.2	249	79.3	68	25.9	87	33.1	81	14.3
303	3	4.6	51	78.5	18	18.6	39	40.2	20	17.5

Table 14 - Year Moved in - City, BB, BH, 101, 303 - 1970

	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
City	32,243	14.8	63,941	29.3	42,623	19.6	78,811	36.2
BB	289	3.3	1,488	17.0	1,301	14.9	5,681	64.9
BH	444	6.5	1,355	19.8	1,342	19.6	3,725	54.3
101	74	10.1	121	16.5	101	13.8	433	59.3
303	15	4.3	68	19.7	70	20.2	193	55.8

Table 15 - Origin of Movers - City, BB, BH, 101, 303 - 1970

	Same House		City		SMSA		N + W		5+ Abroad	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
City	294,797	49.8	141,671	24.0	39,485	6.7	50,631	9.1	29,569	5.1
BB	3,037	17.3	2,392	13.6	2,005	11.4	6,516	37.0	1,636	9.3
BH	3,393	30.8	1,728	15.7	1,226	11.4	2,882	26.2	906	8.2
101	227	9.4	76	3.1	157	6.5	1,039	42.9	154	6.4
303	175	37.1	68	14.4	54	11.4	111	23.5	29	6.2

Table 17 - Unit Size - City, BB, BH - 1960, 1970

		1 R		2R		3R		4-5R		6+R	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1970	City	14,205	6.1	16,354	7.0	36,010	15.5	104,579	45.0	61,104	26.3
	BB	2,927	30.7	2,300	24.1	2,338	24.5	1,499	15.7	467	4.9
	BH	1,829	24.8	1,321	17.9	1,914	25.9	1,752	23.8	557	7.6
1960	City	17,[illegible]	7.5	14,531	6.1	34,[illegible]	14.4	104,637	43.9	67,107	28.1
	BB	2,445	29.6	1,773	21.5	2,102	25.4	1,271	15.4	676	8.2
	BH	1,508	22.9	958	14.6	1,897	28.8	1,625	24.7	591	9.0

Table 18 Unit Size - Selected BG's - 1970

		1R	2R	3R	4-5R	6-7R	8R+
106-1	#	141	210	275	243	11	0
	%	16.0	23.9	31.3	27.7	1.3	0.0
107-5	#	226	183	134	86	8	6
	%	35.2	28.5	20.8	13.4	1.3	.9
108-3	#	108	113	150	89	12	30
	%	21.5	22.5	30.0	17.7	2.4	6.0
201-3	#	95	81	131	90	48	80
	%	18.1	15.4	25.0	17.2	9.1	15.2
202-1	#	368	116	167	213	14	10
	%	41.4	13.1	18.8	23.9	1.6	1.1
202-2	#	80	106	267	293	14	8
	%	10.4	13.8	34.8	38.2	1.8	1.0

Table 19 - Structure Size - City, BB, BH, 106, 203 - 1970

	1 - 2		3 - 4		5 - 49		50+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
City	71,535	30.8	69,213	29.8	79,429	34.2	12,229	5.3
BB	260	2.8	478	5.0	7,300	76.5	1,508	15.8
BH	536	7.3	1,141	15.5	4,427	60.2	1,247	17.0
106	15	1.2	70	5.5	273	21.4	919	72.0
203	24	2.2	77	6.9	437	39.4	572	51.5

Table 20 - Structure Age - City, BB, BH, 106, 203 - 1970

	1940		40 - 59		60 - 64		65-Mar.70	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
City	179,391	77.2	31,876	13.7	7,800	3.4	13,339	5.8
BB	8,251	86.4	292	3.1	94	1.0	908	9.6
BH	6,326	86.1	354	4.8	316	4.3	352	4.8
106	476	37.3	5	.4	29	2.3	767	60.0
203	529	47.7	30	2.7	303	27.3	247	22.3

Table 21 - Vacancy and Tenure - City, BB, BH - 1960 - 1970

		Vacancy		OO		SF OO		RO	
		#	% of Total HU's	#	% of Occ HU's	#	% of Occ HU's	#	% of Occ HU's
1	City	14,791	6.4	59,230	27.2	27,658	12.7	158,392	72.8
9	BB	744	7.8	362	4.1	88	1.0	8,426	95.8
7	BH	541	7.3	609	8.9	278	4.1	6,225	91.1
0									
1	City	14,115	5.9	61,165	27.3	31,707	14.1	163,207	72.8
9	BB	580	7.0	502	6.5	308	4.0	7,184	93.5
6	BH	501	7.6	592	9.7	401	6.6	5,487	90.3
0									

Table 22 - Rent and Value Levels - City, Tracts - 1960, 1970

	CONTRACT			GROSS			VALUE		
	1960	1970	%	1960	1970	%	1960	1970	%
	Med	Med	Δ	Med	Med	Δ	Med	Med	Δ
City	60	93	63.3	78	126	61.5	13,500	19,600	45.2
101	103	157	52.4	108	162	50.0	24,200	21,900	-9.5
106	63	225	257.1	69	236	242.0	24,200	21,900	-9.5
107	113	165	46.0	120	170	41.7	25,000+	50,000+	-9.5
108	103	170	65.1	106	180	69.8	25,000+	50,000+	-9.5
201	115	174	51.3	121	183	51.2	25,000+	50,000+	-9.5
202	75	131	74.7	84	140	66.7	17,900	50,000	179.3
203	39	182	366.7	49	195	298.0	17,900	50,000+	179.3
303	47	201	327.7	48	209	335.4	17,900	50,000+	179.3

Table 16 - Income and Education - City, Tracts - 60 and 70

	FAM. INCOME				INDIV. INCOME		YRS. EDUC.	
	1960	1970	%	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970
	Med	Med	Δ	Mean	Med	Mean	Med	Med
City	5,747	10,272	78.7	10,272	2,819	4,045	11.2	12.1
101	6,441	9,565	48.5	12,515	1,065	2,047	14.3	14.2
106	4,953	19,439	292.5	24,857	7,023	9,792	12.0	13.1
107	7,435	12,579	69.2	15,007	3,450	4,972	13.7	14,8
108	8,866	14,530	63.9	24,605	3,360	5,376	14.6	15.3
201	10,758	18,574	72.7	27,486	5,645	7,824	15.3	16.1
202	5,779	10,908	88.8	12,882	4,524	4,907	12.5	12.9
203	4,979	18,913	279.9	22,122	5,611	7,368	9.1	13.4
303	4,979	11,107	279.9	13,499	7,644	9,007	11.0	13.4

BACK BAY - BEACON HILL

	Population		
	1960	1970	% Δ
City	698,081	641,071	
BB		17,909	
101		2,438	
106	2,379	1,942	
107	6,137	7,266	
108	6,686	6,277	
BH		11,208	
201	5,288	5,443	
202	3,916	3,828	
203		1,470	
303		479	
BB-BH		29,117	

Abbreviations

BH - Beacon Hill
BB - Back Bay
OO - Owner Occupancy
Vac- Vacancy Rate
Prop-Proportion
AG - Age Group
BG - Block Group

HOUSING

	1960	1970	% Δ
City	238,547	232,448	- 2.6
BB	8,267	9,537	15.4
101	406	787	93.8
106	1,647	1,266	-23.1
107	2,868	4,042	40.9
108	3,346	3,442	2.9
BH	6,182	7,379	19.4
201	2,881	3,404	18.2
202	2,107	2,485	17.9
203	1,194	1,123	- 5.9
303	-	367	-
BB-BH	14,449	16,916	17.1

I. INTRO.
II. STATISTICAL DATA
A. POPULATION

1. Age Groups

There are no kids (0-14) in BB-BH. Props of AG 20-24 very high. BB has large prop of 15-19 and 25-34. BH has still larger prop of 25-34 and small prop of 15-19 (all relative to City). So BB more oriented to students than BH, which may have more young marrieds or older singles.

BH has props of AG's 35+ not unlike the City's. BB has smaller prop's but not extremely so. Large prop's of 15-34 thus seem to be at the expense of 0-14.

TABLE 4

BG ANALYSIS:

In Bh, with small props of 15-19, only BG 3 of 201 vaires with a larger prop (probably an Emerson College dorm, 11.7% group quarters). This BG is on the Common and might indicate more students, but the props of 20-24 belie this analysis. Props of this AG are enormous and the Comb St. side (202, 1 of 201) and almost normal on the Common side (201, 203, 303) of BH. Props of 25-34 are greater than 20-24 on the Common side, less on the Comb St. side. On the Comb Street side (excepting BG 1 of 202), the props of 35+ AG's are all lower than the district's and the City's. On the Common side, they tend to be higher, (for instance, 13.3% of AG 65-74 in BG 1 of 202).

In BB, only BG2 of 106 has any prop of kids at all, and there it's only 9.3% (0-14). Props of 15-19 and 20-24 vary . In tract 101, each age group has 40% of the population. In tract 106, all props are small relative to the district. In tracts 107 and 108, AG 15-19 props vary from 4.2% to 27.6%; AG 20-24 props also vary but for exceed the City's in all BG's. Props of AG 25-34 are generally large when AG 15-19 props are small and vice versa. Props of AG's over 35 are small with a few exceptions for 65+, but in BG1 of 106 (Pru apt Towers) all AG's above 35 have very high prop's. Thus BG appears to have very high prop's of childless adults of all ages over 25.

TABLE 5

2. Race

In no BG is there a significantly large prop of blacks or other races, except BG2 of 106. Thus BG was the only one in BB to have any kids. In 1970 it had 22.9% blacks and 13.4% other races; both prop's are sharp increased over 1960.

3. HH Size

All tracts are similar in having an enormus prop of 1 person HH's, all hovering around 60%. The prop's of 2 person HH's are about equal the City's, so the total prop of 1 and 2 person HH's is just under 90% for almost all tracts. The prop of 5+ person HH's is under 2% for almost all tracts. The median HH size is 1.3 or 1.4 persons, for less than the City's 2.2 person median.

TABLE 6

In 1960, the same pattern existed, but in the last decade, 1 person HH's have gained at the expense of others. The only exception

is tract 106, which suffered the addition of Prudential housing in the last 10 years.

BG's vary more than tracts, but the pattern is the same. Generally when the prop of 1 person HH's is lower, the prop of 2 person HH's is greater.

TABLE 7

4. Overcrowding

There is less overcrowding in BB and BH than in the City, and it declined since 1960 as in the City. But note than in BB-BH, critical overcrowding (1.51 and persons/rm) is greater than in the whole City; in fact, this more critical overcrowding is greater than the less critical (1.01 - 1.50 persons/rm) in every tract but one, very unlike most other tracts in the City. An explanation is that overcrowding in BB-BH occurs in small units for small HH's, whereas in other parts of the City, it has been shown that the ratio of 6+ rm units/6+ person HH's is a good predicter of overcrowding. If a large HH is a large unit adds one person and becomes overcrowded, it will be non-critical. If one person is an efficiency (not overcrowded) adds 1 person, the unit is critically overcrowded. The preponderance of small HH's is great enough to add weight to this explanation.

TABLE 8

Overcrowding rises above 5% in only 4 BG's or tracts. In all cases the prop of critical overcrowding is the chief cause.

TABLE 9

5. HH Relationship

Props of husbands or wives is significantly less than for the City (especially in BB), but the prop of female heads of HH's is also

very low. The important statistic is the miniscule prop of "other relatives." The differences is made up by large props of male and female primary individuals, "non-relatives of head", and (for BB only) those in group quarters. This reflects earlier analysis of AG's

TABLE 10

BG ANALYSIS:

In BB, this pattern persists. Prepertions of primary individuals and "non-relatives are always high but vary inversely with the prop of group quarters. As might be expected, those in group quarters are bunched into 4 or 5 BG's. The extreme of this is tract 101, where the prop of the prop in group quarters is 66%. Note that this statistic in 101 is a product of taking %'s of tracts. Those group quarters are BU dorms which largely are not in the part of 101 which is included by BB-BH.

In BB also, tract 106 is unusual in 2 ways (1) BG1 (Pru) has very large props of husbands or wives but still tiny props of other relatives (in numbers 288 couples vs 130 other relatives). Since there are only 57 people in AG 0-19, most of these other relatives must be non-kids. Further analysis suggests that the Pru housing has many childless couples of all ages (from HH size, AG's, and HH relationship). (2) BG2 has the largest prop of other relatives (60 couples vs 109 other relatives). There are 105 persons in AG 0-19, 62 in AG 0-14, so most of the other relatives are kids. Since this BG has the only significant props of blacks and other races, a guess would be that families of these races coexist with white students or other singles.

In BH, all BG's follow the district pattern. One should note only BG1 of 202. It was the only BG on the Comb St. side of BH to have large props of older adults. Here it is shown to hava a huge prop of male primary individuals (40.5%). These could be men of all ages fairly temporary stays to conduct government buiseness, since BG1 is among a few BG's closest to the heart of gov't activity.

TABLE 11

6. Rent/Income Ratio

Both BB and BH have prop's of poor smaller than the City's and prop's of those earning over $10,000 larger than the City's. Then rent/income ratio is higher than the City's in all income categories.

There is little variation in the tract level. The effect of the Pru housing an tract 106 can be seen in the prop of its pop with incomes over $10,000 (50%). Tracts 203 and 303 also have large prop's of this income category. The 3 are the only tracts with a rent income ratio over .20 for the $10-15,000 income group.

Note that the housing in tract 303 is new since 1960, and presumably luxury, like Pru.

Tract 101 has over 50% poor, a statistic which must relate to its 66% pop in group quarters.

TABLE 12 & 13

7. Mobility

The prop of HH's moving in during the last 2 years is far above the City's, usually over 50%. In all other time periods the prop was less, although close for the 65-67 period. For origin of movers, the stay is told by the much smaller prop in the same house 5 yrs ago, the smaller prop moving from the City, and the much large prop moving from the North

or West (origins for students and the young).

BH has less mobility than BB and s smaller prop moving from the North or West.

In tract 106, the pattern of well-off folks moving to the Pur, from the suburbs is supported by a high mobility and a very large prop moving from within the SMSA. and within the City, relative to the district. Note that the fact that tract 106 has a mobility not unlike the district's despite much new housing in BG1, may show some stability in BG2.

Tracts 101, 107, and 108, the "heart" of the BB student pop shows nearly 40% moving from the North and West.

TABLE 14 and 15

8. Income and Education

b. HOUSING TABLE 16

1. Unit Size

Whereas the largest props of units in the whole City are of those with 3-6 rooms, the large props in BB and BH are clearly for units with 1-3 rooms. The clearest trend from 1960 is an increase in the prop of 1rm units, a decrease in the prop of 6+ rm units, more marked in BB-BH than in the City.

TABLE 17

Sharp increases in 1 rm units occurred in tracts 201 and 202, which is probably the result of subdivision of old townhouses.. In tract 201 (especially BG's 2 and 3) there probably remain many townhouses still occupied by one family. BG's 2 and 3 have the highest prop of 8+ rm units, easily above the City's average. Sharp decreases in (rm units occurred in tracts 106 (BG) and 203, balanced by increased in the props of 2,3, and 4 rm units, probably the result of new construction. Tract

303 is also hearing on 2 and 3 rm units rather than (rm units relavite to the City.)

In the heart of BB (101, 107, 108), only BG3 of 108 has a significant prop of 6+ rm units, but the pattern holds for most BG's that the prop of 8+ rm units is higher than 6 or 7 rm units, indicating possible large townhouses. Also in this area, one could probably predict new construction by when the prop of 2-4 rm units is high relative to 1 rm units.

TABLE 18

2. Type and Age of Structure

Whereas about 1/3 of the City's housing stock is in each of the 3-4 and 5-9 unit structures categories, 2/3 of the housing in BB-BH is in 5-49 unit structures. The housing in BB-BH is older than the City's, 80% built before 1940 vs 77% for the City

Tracts with new construction (106, 203, 303) are the only tracts with less than 90% of housing built before 1940. Also, the prepondance of their units are in structures of 50 units or more, indicating that new construction has been in very large buildings.

TABLE 19 and 20

3. Vacancy and Tenure

Vacancy is somewhat greater in BB and BH than in the whole City, and OO is very much lower. Vacancy increased over the last 10 years for both the district and the City; OO decreased in the district, remained stable in the City.

TABLE 21

Vacancy is higher and OO lower in BB tracts than in BH tracts. Vacancy in BH tracts stands at about 6%, except for tract 203, with at

13.5% VR. OO is low in BH, except for tract 201, the more stable side of BH, which has 13.7% OO. One BG of 201, BG3, still has 25.0% OO, which is a very high degree of owner occupied structures.

In BB, only one BG has more than 6% OO (BG 3 of 108). Vac varies between 5% and 10%.

4. Rent and Value Levels

Rents are much higher than in the whole City, but the most remarkable statistic is the incredible increase in median rent level in tracts 106, 203, and 303 with increases, well over 200%. Each tract has new construction, but the degree of change is no less startling.

The highest rents in BB-BH are in tract 106 (median gross rent = $236), followed by tract 303 and 203. The lowest is tract 202, with a median rent of $140.

Outside of tract 101, where median value declined, recorded median values in other tracts are in the $50,000 and category, sharing the worth of old townhouses and brownstones. Tract 202 shows an increase of 179% in value.

TABLE 22

8. Income and Education (should be in 1. Population)

Median incomes and education are much higher than the City's medians for all tracts.

As expected, the highest median family and individual income is in tract 106, followed closely by tract 203 and 201. Tract 201 also has the highest mean family income. Tract 106 and 203 have little OO; luxury housing has drawn well-off families to center City. Tract 201 is a pop of well-off families that has bought old townhouses and such. There is still some stability there. Tract 201 also has a median education of 16.1 yrs completed, probably the highest in the City.

Tract 101 has the lowest median income, median individual income being very low at $1,065. These are the students in dorms.

TABLE 16

BACK BAY - BEACON HILL

CORRELATIONS

1. Do Areas of Age Concentration Correlate With

Household Relationship: There is a strong correlation between the very small props of other relatives and the very small props of AG 0-14, and between the large props of primary individuals, non-relatives and group quaters and the large props of AG 15-24. Props of AG 15-19 correlate very closely with prop of group quarters (the 5 BG's with the largest prop of AG 15-19 have the largest prop of group quarters). Props of 25-34 correlate somewhat with large props of husbands/wives, but only when the prop of 0-4 is larger (as in tract 201 BH). This means that members of AG 25-34 are more likely to be parents in BH than in BB; on the other hand, the prop of AG 35_ is also larger in tract 201.

Household Size: The large props of 1P HH's, an 2P HH's, obvisouly makes sense in light of the large props of young people. But the prop of 1 & 2P HH's taken together is very steady and seems to differences in age concentration.

The increase in 1P HH's over already high levels in 1960 should be set alongside the fact that the increase in AG 15-34 came at the expense of AG 35+. Since there were few kids in 1960 either, it would seem that some older couples or have given way to younger people living alone. In Tracts 101, 107, 108, 201, and 202, this seems plausible since the prop of 2P HH's declined. In tracts 106, 203, 303, where 2P HH's increased at the expense of 1P HH's but the pop still became much younger (exp in 203, 303) it is interesting to note that the sexes were more balanced in 1970 than 1960. (203: M/W, 58/42 49/51: 303: M/W, 72/28 - 45/55).

Mobility - All tracts in BH are more stable than all in BB. Tracts 101, 107, and 108 (BB) have the largest props of young people (AG 15-24) in the district and tract 106 saw a great deal of new construction. These same 3 tracts (101, 107, 108) had the largest props of people moving from the north and west, whereas tract 106 had mobility generated by movers from the City and the SMSA (largest props for each).

Tenure - On the tract level, there would seem to be a slight correlation between prop of AG 25-34 and amount of OO, but the correlation falls apart at the BG level. Even though intuition would say that HH's will be different from the largely youth dominated population, OO generally is so low that variations have no appreciable impact in age group patterns.

Vacancy - The causes of vacancy in BB-BH are quite varied and so are the age patterns that high vacancy is associated with. A high VR exists in the Prudential BG (slack demand for luxury housing? incomplete rent-up?) with its concentration of older couples. A high VR exists in tract 203, where half the vacant units are not on the market (West End renewal, new construction on BH?) and where there is a probable concentration of older people living alone. One BG in tract 202 has a much higher VR than the others and a much higher prop of AG 20-24, but in BB, BG;s with similarly high props have low VR;s and vice versa.

Income - The tracts with the lowest median incomes (family and individual) were clearly those tracts with the largest concentration of young people. (Tracts 101, 107, 108, 202).

Med Inc	% 20-24	Tract	Med Income	% 20-24	Tract
1127	40.0	101	7111	18.8	201
4072	33.2	107	6628	18.6	203
5108	32.1	202	8289	16.5	303
4279	31.7	108	9421	11.4	106

Rent Levels - Exactly the same pattern can be described for rent levels as for income.

Med Gross Rent	%20-24	Tract	Med Gross Rent	%20-24	Tract
162	40.0	101	183	18.8	201
140	33.2	107	195	18.6	203
170	32.1	202	209	16.5	303
180	31.7	108	236	11.4	106

This is an interesting result, but it should be noted that the 3 highest median rents are really due to construction of luxury apts.

2. Does Tenure Correlate With:

Structure Type - As usual structure type is a good predicts of OO.

	STRUC. TYPE				
Tract	1-2	3-4	5-49	50+	OO
201	11.2	15.1	67.0	6.7	13.7
202	4.9	20.7	65.5	8.9	5.9
108	3.4	4.0	87.4	5.2	5.9
101	4.6	5.0	63.4	27.0	3.8
107	2.3	5.7	87.1	4.9	3.6
303	2.5	10.8	24.9	62.2	3.5
203	2.2	6.9	39.4	51.5	2.3
106	1.2	5.5	21.4	72.0	1.2

Unit Size - The props of units with 6 or more rooms predicts the above order fairly well though not as well as structural type. A large prop of 6+R unit or 8+ R units will usually correlate with single family homes and thus with OO. In tract 201, for instance, with over twice the amount of OO as any other tract, has over twoce the prop of units in single family homes and over twoce the prop of units with 8 or more rooms as any other tract. In tracs with very low OO with virtually no single family homes, unit size is less a factor.

Mobility - Excluding those tracts with much new construction (which skews mobility patterns). The props of people arriving in the last 2 years vaires inversely with OO. Tract 201 has the lowest prop and Tract 107 the highest. Tract 201 has the largest prop of HH's arriving before 1960 and tract 107 the lowest (all this excludes 106, 203, 303).

Income - Of the 3 tracts with the highest median incomes, 2 have very low OO (303, 106) and 1 has the highest OO (201). OO would correlate with income outside of newly built luxury apartments.

Rent Levels - The highest rents are naturally in the luxury apartments, where there is little OO. But even, outside these tracts, OO correlates very little with rent levels.

3. Does Vacancy Correlate With:

Mobility - There is some correlation between mobility and high vacancy outside of the 3 tracts with considerable new construction. Of the other 5, the 2 with the lowest VR has the smallest prop of HH's arriving in the last 2 years, and the 2 with the largest VR have the largest prop of such HH's. This is not a strong correlation.

No other correlations in tracts with new construction of large apt bldgs, the rent-up troubles of a single building could have a heavy impact on the VR.

4. Does Unit Size Correlate With:

Household Size - The prop of 1P HH's varies only from 55% to 62% among tracts, the prop of 1-2P HH's varies only from 87% to 90%, the median HH size varies only from 1.3 to 1.4. Unit size varies much more among tracts and thus doesn't correlate.

Note some comparisons between tracts. Tracts 201 and 202 have about the same median unit size and HH size (2.8 & 2.9, 1.3 & 1.4). Tract 201 has a much larger prop of large units. Tract 202 has a smaller prop of 1-2 R units and a larger prop of 3-4R units. Overcrowding is less in tract 202, because its fewer small units and more medium units alleivate the critical overcrowding found in small HH's. On the other hand tract 201 has slightly less non-critical overcrowding (1.01-1.50 pers/rm).

This same comparison can be made more strongly between tracts 107 and 108.

Structure Type - There is a strong correlation between larger units and smaller structures outside of the 3 tracts with much new construction. Tracts 201 and 202 clearly have the largest units and the smallest structures. Tracts 107 and 108 are clearly next.

Among the tracts with new construction, the correlation is opposite. Tract 106 has the largest units of the 3 and the largest prop of units in structures with 502 apts. Tract 203 has the smallest units of the 3 and the smallest prop in such structures.

Income - none

5. Do Rent Levels Correlate With:

Values - There is little way to judge. Four tracts have median values of $50,000 and a one of $50,000 exactly. Median rents among these 5 tracts vary considerably,although the lowest is that with

the exact $50,000 median. One tract (101) has a relatively low median value of $21,900 (the only one to decline) and the second lowest median rent. Two tracts (106 and 303) have negligible single family homes.

Structure Type and Age - It is the tracts (106, 203, 303) with the largest, newest bldgs that have the highest rents. Outside these tracts, there is no correlation.

Mobility - None

6. Does Overcrowding Correlate With:

Household Relationship - Outside the tracts with new construction, overcrowding correlates with the prop of the population in groups quarters (highest in 101, less in 107 and 108, least in 201 and 202). The presence of group quarters in this case could be another way of describing the nearness of a college, which would cause overcrowding for locational reasons. This correlation does not work too well for BG's, but that is too fine a gain for this explanation.

Note that no tract in BB-Bh has overcrowding equal that of the whole City.

Rent/Income Ratio: There is no strong correlation, although variation is too small for both variables to judge well. Note though that BB-BH gives decidedly worse rent breaks to its population than does the City as a whole (true for every tract) and overcrowding is less than every tract. This contradicts the supposed correlation and could be due to the ability of young people to pay a much higher percentage of income for rent.

7. Does Rent/Income Ratio Correlate With:

Unit Size - Outside of tracts with new construction, there is a

correlation between a larger prop of 6+R units and a high rent/income ratio. The correlation works for income categories of"$5,000 and less" $5-10,000.

Income and Rents - Tracts with the highest incomes and rents are clearly those with the highest rent/income ratios (106, 201, 203, 303). The correlation works for the poor except in tract 203, which gives the best break to the poor in the district but which also give the lowest median income of the four tracts above. The correlation works for $5-10,000 except for 106. The correlation works best for $10,000+ where the 3 tracts with new construction are clearly those with the highest ratios and where tract 106 (with 50% of its people in this category has the highest ratio).

The fact that tract 107 and 108 give there worst rent breaks to the highest incomes may be accounted for by the presence of some new construction (especially in 108 along the river) which may house some of these people.

Household Relationship - This suggests another explanation for a high rent/income ratio. Students are able to pay higher rents by doubling up and lessening the impact of the rent on any one income. Thus, does the prop of non-relatives correlate with a low ratio. The correlation exists, but not too strongly. For specific tracts (like 202) the presence of many non-relatives helps explain the low ratio.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 06314 425 5

B65R.BaB

BACK BAY-BEACON HILL
BRA Research Department
Back Bay-Beacon Hill Data
Analysis & Correlations
Draft